Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 12 Oct 94   Volume 94 : Issue 486

Today's Topics:
                              calls
                CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It) (2 msgs)
                         Death of ham radio
                          RF Lightbulbs
                The code debate....my view (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 10 Oct 1994 04:28:00 GMT
From: niles.stacey@infoway.com (Niles Stacey)
Subject: calls

WI>Path: miwok!well!pacbell.com!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!network.ucsd.edu!news-mail-gatew
WI>From: William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM
WI>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
WI>Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get O
WI>Date: 9 Oct 94 01:54:54 GMT
WI>Organization: ucsd usenet gateway
WI>Lines: 10
WI>Message-ID: <199410090155.SAA27715@ucsd.edu>
WI>NNTP-Posting-Host: ucsd.edu
WI>Originator: daemon@ucsd.edu

WI>>I think that I'll wait 'till I can get a "CA6??" call before I send in a
WI>>request for a new call! (g) I wonder if I'll still be here when or if
WI>>it gets around to the CA6s...

```
  WI>> __...  ...__    N6ZVZ


  WI>moving to canada, are we...?  US is only W, K, N and AA to AL...it's going t
  WI>be a pretty long wait for a CA6.. license issued by the FCC....8)

  WI>73, bill

  True  enough.  i'm just delighted that i was fortunate enough to have
  been assigned a call that has so much rythm.  I guess I got a little
  carried away with the CA6... the rate at which new extra calls are going
  it seems that soon we will have been through the entire alpha series in
  only a decade or so.  (g)

  I wonder what will happen when we run out of "A" calls.  Will we simply
  stop issuance?  or will calls revert to the next in the "K" series!

  __... ...__,  Niles - N6ZVZ
  ---
   * SLMR 2.1a * Practice random kindness and senseless acts of beauty.

  ------------------------------

  Date: 11 Oct 1994 06:57:40 GMT
  From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)
  Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

  In <ps92JnA.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:


  >
  >michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> writes:
  >
  >>Nobody *needs* a ham license.  If you think all licensing and other standards
  >>are "coercion" than you must spend a lot of time feeling coerced.  I notice
  >>nobody complains of being coerced into passing element 2, which, unlike CW
  >>*is* required of all (U.S.) hams.
  >
  >A person who wants to use amateur radio DOES need a license.
  >
  >As for "nobody complains (about) element 2, which...*is* required of all
  >U.S. hams," maybe it's because element 2 is relevant and the Morse elements no
  >longer are?
  >
  Fine, you're being coerced.  Martyrs to the cause, and all that.  Can "persecuted"
  and "opressed" be far behind?  Always watch your back, a CW goon may be
  lurking....

  As Jeff would say, Sheesh!
```

Mike, KK6GM

-> This "voluntary activity" involves obtaining a license from the
-> GOVERNMENT to regain a privilege that that government has, by law,
-> taken away. When the only choices are "do as Uncle Sam says or find
-> another hobby" it isn't truly voluntary.
->
-> -- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Priviledge?

Jeffrey fSchwartz <fschwaj@iia.org> writes:

>   I recently heard that a ham in southern NJ was forced to sell his
>house (at a loss) and move because his radio (which was deemed clean by
>the FCC) was generating noise on someone's doorbell. The neighbor sued
>for a large sum citing an invasion of privacy. The neighbor refused to
>do anything as simple as to allow a filter to be installed or a new
>doorbell to be installed. Does anyone know anything about this case. I

Find a stupid enough jury, and anything can happen.

Don't forget that the Communications Act does NOT always preempt local laws
just because radio is involved -- call up your local talk radio show and libel
your city councilman, and you CAN be sued in a state court just as if you had
done it in a letter to the editor of your local newspaper.

Jim Boos (Jim.Boos@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

: Hi...   Thanks for reading...   A few years back I recall hearing about R&D
: work being done on RF driven lighting devices. I think it had to do with
: exciting a floresent type gas in a standard lightbulb style device. Did
: this idea get type accepted and where did this technology go?
: --
:   --

As far as I know, the "R&D" that caused such a stir years ago never resulted
in devices being brough to market.

If anyone would like a copy of the extensive ARRL Technical Information
Service file on this, send a 9X12" SASE with three units of postage to me
here at HQ, with a request for the "RF Bulbs" file.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed
--
Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org

Date: 11 Oct 1994 21:28:01 -0400
From: tomsunman@aol.com (TOM SUNMAN)
Subject: The code debate....my view

     I am currently studying for my Tech license. The way I'M approaching
this is this way. At the moment I'm VERY interested in becoming a ham.
I'll get my Tech license first to get my feet wet as it were. I WILL
eventually upgrade as time goes by. I will STUDY for the 5 wpm code test
and when passed I will proceed to study for the NEXT upgrade. I think the
"no codes" are taking a bit of a beating here from what I've been reading.
Just because someone is not interested in learning code doesn't mean they
will mess up the airwaves for others. I myself would like to eventually
climb the ladder a bit and get upgraded because I find the whole thing
interesting and it seems like a LOT of fun. Some folks just aren't
interested in code, so what? The vast majority I feel will be just as
respectable on the air and follow the rules the same as everyone else
does.
     In any event, I look foward to becoming a ham! I'm studying my head
off.

Tom Randall
Poughkeepsie,N.Y.

Date: 11 Oct 1994 22:39:55 -0500

From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)
Subject: The code debate....my view

In article <37fe31$7j0@newsbf01.news.aol.com>,
TOM SUNMAN <tomsunman@aol.com> wrote:
>   I am currently studying for my Tech license. The way I'M approaching
>this is this way. At the moment I'm VERY interested in becoming a ham.
>I'll get my Tech license first to get my feet wet as it were. I WILL
>eventually upgrade as time goes by. I will STUDY for the 5 wpm code test
>and when passed I will proceed to study for the NEXT upgrade. I think the
>"no codes" are taking a bit of a beating here from what I've been reading.
>Just because someone is not interested in learning code doesn't mean they
>will mess up the airwaves for others. I myself would like to eventually
>climb the ladder a bit and get upgraded because I find the whole thing
>interesting and it seems like a LOT of fun. Some folks just aren't
>interested in code, so what? The vast majority I feel will be just as
>respectable on the air and follow the rules the same as everyone else
>does.

Tom, not all Codeless Technicians are "taking a beating." Just the few
who believe that they should be able to upgrade without fulfilling the
Morse requirement. Unlike yourself, they are either unable or unwilling
to meet the required elements in the current system, and because of
this, they want it changed by eliminating the Morse requirement.

The code element, be it at 5 or 20 wpm, is the last remaining test in
the Amateur Service in which one actually has to put forth reasonable
effort in which to pass. Over the years, the written elements have
become easier and easier, and have now reached the point where anyone
can go down to their nearest Radio Shack, buy the exact question pool,
memorize it, and pass the test. In other words, nothing has to be
learned, no skill must be acquired, and there appears to be a lack of
pride or value in the ticket many of these "new hams" have supposedly
earned. Try listening on Two Meters sometime, which is the band that
they have all seemed to flock to.

If you DO sincerely wish to upgrade beyond the Codeless Technician
level, I wish you the best of luck. Passing 5 wpm is not very difficult
to accomplish, and there are computer programs and cassettes to help
you achieve that. There are also a lot of good hams out there like
Dan Pickersgill, who air code practice sessions locally over Two Meters.
If someone like Dan exists in your town, be sure to call on him for help.

Good luck on your test.

--
"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Tue, 11 Oct 94 02:34:11 -0500
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<CxF8z8.Kxy@news.Hawaii.Edu> <pu81hrM.edellers@delphi.com>,
<37c6kr$88i@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

Dr. Michael Mancini <mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> writes:

>Can you say "whine?" Sure you can!

Can you say "name-calling?" I knew you could!

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Tue, 11 Oct 1994 17:49:03 GMT
From: ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare (KA1CV))

References<36q11m$32f$1@rosebud.ncd.com> <CxAAvv.B7p@world.std.com>,
<CxBCFv.314u@austin.ibm.com>
Subject: Re: Is this a Part 97 violation?

Mickey McInnis (mcinnis@austin.ibm.com) wrote:

: Well, I think the only way it's legal is if it's an emergency. I think
: the best way to determine if it's an emergency is this:

: Pretend you will be fined and/or have your licence revoked if you take
: action "X". Would you still take action "X" if you knew this would
: happen? If not, maybe it's not a "real" emergency.

This presumes that one would be willing to risk one's license to save
another person's life. :-)

If I had any doubts about a situation being an emergency, I would ask the
person involved if they believed it to be an emergency. If they said yes, I
would probably take their word and treat it as such.

73, Ed
--
Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org

In article <37c5ak$4mp@chnews.intel.com>,
Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com> wrote:
>In article <CxAGw6.BIE@news.hawaii.edu>,
>Jeff Herman, NH6IL <jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu> wrote:
>
> {some deleted}
>
>>Really Jim, why would you expect more from HF CW than from
>>2M? As a matter of fact (AAMOF?), I do hear more technical
>>matters being discussed on HF CW than I copy on 2M. This
>>might be due to my QTH being in the Central Pacific - foreign
>>hams seem to love technical QSO's.
>
>Simple - time and effort to qualify for access:
>
> 2m - 2 to 4 weeks study of theory and regs.
>
> CW - 30 years of code practice to reach 13 wpm.
>   (Anything less than 13 wpm doesn't seem to
>   qualify as "CW" in these parts)

Let's see...I'm 32 and have my Extra, and it took three years for me
advance through the Amateur ranks. I guess the difference between me
and you is that I really wanted it, and decided to put forth the effort
to do what was necessary to get that class, instead of whining about it.
You know, I have friends who are trying to get their college degrees,
and the years go by and they never get them. Why? They expected that
diploma to be handed to them of a silver platter. So, they haven't
earned it yet. There was a time when I wanted to be a radiologist,
however I also knew that I would have four years of medical school
ahead, plus one year of internship, three years of residency, and
one additional year in my specialty. That was certainly something I
COULD achieve, but chose not to. And I didn't go down to Baylor
College of Medicine or UT Medical School whining that I want my M.D.
but all those clinical and classroom hours are unnecessary (I DO
disagree with the current teaching strategy of most traditional
medical schools, but that's another topic for another forum).
But the fact remains that nothing worthwhile in life ever comes easily.

--

"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

Date: Tue, 11 Oct 1994 23:01:10 -0400 (EDT)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access4.digex.net>

References<Pine.SUN.3.90.941008214346.25424D-100000@access4.digex.net>
<37bg1d$j8d@hacgate2.hac.com>, <37c7qu$sdj@news.iastate.edu>
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

On 10 Oct 1994, William J Turner wrote:

> In article <37bg1d$j8d@hacgate2.hac.com> suggs@tcville.es.hac.com writes:
> >I hate surveys that combine two questions into one, but only allow for
> >one answer:
> >
> >>16. The International Morse Code is obsolete and should be eliminated
> >>   as a requirement for amateur radio licensing.
> >
> It would at least be better if the question was whether the
> *requirement* is obsolete. There is more of a correlation between the
> two, then.
>
>

Considering how much I had to go through to get this out quickly since the
ballots have already been mailed, I'm flattered that you guys only found
fault with one question. However, the phrasing is deliberate and is based
on the usual argument that is proffered for eliminating the code from
amateur radio examinations.

73

Tony
K4KYO

Date: 11 Oct 1994 02:30:38 GMT
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<xa1VRQz.edellers@delphi.com> <37a9hs$dag@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<ps925jA.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:
: gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> writes:
:
: >You don't HAVE to know RTTY shift (if you don't use RTTY), or what
: >freq is black for ATV (if you don't use ATV), or what an AND gate is
: >(if you don't plan to build a circuit), or "drum speed" if you aren't
: >interested in facsimile to use the spectrum _wisely_ either. Why not
: >just forget the whole idea of testing?? (that's a rhetorical question
: >in case anyone missed the tone)
:
: Maybe we SHOULD drop the questions on which frequency represents black in ATV
: operation, and stick to that which is truly common across all modes and bands?

No, we shouldn't, Ed. Nor should we drop any of the requirements.
The point I was making (through absurdism) is basically that you can
use the "I'm not gonna use it so why should I know it" argument
against almost (_almost_) every question on the test...doesn't mean
it's right. We as amateurs have the privilege of operating _any_ of
the modes/freqs available to our license class. And we are expected
to know what we need to know to do all this safely. The lowest
"common" denominator is too low and defeats the purpose of the
service.
Greg WB0RTK

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #486
****